

## TPA UAC Meeting Minutes

November 2, 2010

**Members Present:** Nancy Farnan, Barbara Goldman, Caryl Hodges, Jason Immekus, Susan Macy, Nicole Merino, Lori Misaki, Steve Turley, Katie Pedley (by phone)

**Staff Present:** Wayne Bacer, Teri Clark, Katie Croy, Terry Janicki, Phi Phi Lau, Gay Roby, Michael Taylor

### Welcome and Introductions

Co-chair Caryl welcomed the group and new member, Barbara Goldman. Members introduced themselves and the group/stakeholders they represent.

### Committee Updates

Model Representatives:

- FAST is continuing its assessments even though there are fewer candidates. Scoring, training, and calibration have begun. CSU, Fresno has also turned in their Biennial Report (BR).
- PACT is getting started with the year. They are preparing for calibration. The 2010 Implementation Conference will be held this week, Nov. 4-5. It is an implementation conference for users of PACT. PACT has informed the work of a national performance assessment. Currently, 20 states are interested in the work. TPAC, also known as Teachers Performance Assessment Consortium is a national consortium that is based on the work of PACT. Steve asked about the formal process of TPAC, and how it might affect the evolution of assessment in California. Terry Janicki said that agenda item number 9 focuses on TPA 2.0, and the evolution of the current system. Steve stated that the TPA UAC group does not have purview of what is being done nationally. Teri Clark mentioned the update of modifications and the structural changes of the three models, and brought up the question of when a technical review might be needed for each of the three TPA models. Katie commented that models need to be mindful that if one model changes, then alignment of all three models may change.
- CalTPA is now working on benchmark cases, monitoring and tracking the cases on point. Tasks from last year have been collected from CalTPA programs. So far, about 64% of programs submitted DI tasks, and about 52% submitted AL tasks. There is a big pool of cases to choose from, and CTC and ETS are going through the cases. Wayne continues to do initial assessor trainings. The 2011 schedule is confirmed but will be reviewed by the CalTPA Steering Committee for approval before it is posted on the CTC website.

From all members:

- Wayne: Regarding Assessing Learning tasks, student work is not submitted with the cases sent to him for the benchmarking/recalibration process. The other challenge is related to placement of candidates in classrooms where they can meet the CalTPA requirements of having a focus student who is an English Language Learner and for the Assessing Learning Task, an identified special needs student. Programs and candidates are trying to get through the process. During the benchmark process, things have been uncovered such as placement issues.
- Lori: A new online task submission process has been developed. It is similar to Task Stream. She will update on the process and how it is working.
- Steve: Questions how to disseminate the TPA UAC agenda, minutes and recommendations to the field.
  - ACTION ITEM: Set up a TPA and CalTPA distribution email. Additionally, a PSA will be set up by CTC staff, and it will be posted on the CTC website.

### **Review of Meeting Minutes and Agenda Review**

Caryl asked the group if the minutes from the May 19, 2010 meeting should be approved and whether corrections or changes needed to be made. Steve asked if the Across Model Transfers (p. 4 of the minutes) action item had been done. For CalTPA, the CalTPA Implementation Manual specified on pg. 2-17 that it is up to each program to accept the transfer. Issues about cross-model transfer will be discussed with item #7 about score validity.

- ACTION ITEM: Further discussion about cross-model transfers

Steve moved to approve the minutes. Jason seconded, and the group approved the May 19, 2010 TPA UAC Meeting minutes.

Future meeting minutes will be drafted by CTC staff within two weeks after the end of each meeting. The minutes will be sent to the co-chairs for review and editing. Co-chairs will email the draft minutes to the group and the group has one week to email back a response to the draft. The minutes will be posted as a “draft” on the CTC website. When the group approves the minutes at the next meeting, the “approved” minutes will replace the “draft” minutes on the CTC website.

### **Letter to Superintendents and Deans**

There was an issue raised about teacher candidates not being placed in English Learner (EL) and Special Needs (SN) classrooms. The school’s priority is to place candidates in classrooms where students are achieving, not whether the classrooms have EL or SN learners or not (Nancy). Candidate placements in schools are difficult due to placement permissions from schools and cost from the preparation program (Barbara). It is a challenge, but can work with superintendents and deans about placements. Steve raised a question about whether this is an issue and should a letter be sent out? Nicole questioned where this issue came from and what the background is? Wayne talked to CalTPA coordinators, and the issue was raised at the CalTPA Coordinators’ Meeting in April. Additionally, Wayne asked the group about what is being needed for a TPA group to address an issue when it is raised? Susan described what CSU, Fresno does with candidates who cannot be placed with SN students. Candidates are giving hypothetical students to use, and it is signed off by the dean that there are no SN or EL students in their classroom. It is not mandatory for PACT candidates to have identified EL or SN students in the classroom. EL is suggested, but not required. Nicole questioned the need for the letter. Schools have their own issues, and it is best to keep this in context (Barbara). Teacher ed. programs are being creative in meeting requirements, and how they manage differs from place to place. This is something we don’t have control of. Wayne questioned whether using hypothetical students to meet the requirements of the TPEs is allowed. Susan answered that it depended on the student’s task. If the assessment of the TPEs is set up for those certain tasks, then using hypothetical students would work. All models should have the same implementation (Wayne). Implementation of all candidates is universal, but there will be outliers (Steve). Decision was made that the letter will go to the superintendent and a second person from the school/campus. Steve asked the group for approval to have a letter drafting the concerns of candidate placements in an EL and SN classroom. Susan, Steve, Caryl, Katie, Wayne, Nancy, and Jason approved to have a letter drafted.

- ACTION ITEM: Terry will draft the letter and send it to the group for review.

### **TPA/Accreditation Activities Update (Teri Clark & Cheryl Hickey)**

Cheryl was not present. Teri provided update to the group on accreditation. Two handouts were passed out at the meeting (“Questions for the Program Sampling Team Member” and “Information on TPA Assessors”). Standards #17-19 were previously reviewed at the TPA/Accreditation meeting on June 15, 2010. Teri asked Nicole if a 2 page summary of the PACT model has been drafted for the site visits. Wayne completed one for CalTPA.

- ACTION ITEM: Nicole will draft a 2 page summary of the PACT model and send it to Teri.

Teri continued to explain the “Questions for the Program Sampling Team Member” handout to the group. The handout is a guide to check on TPA implementation.

A Specially focused TPA Implementation Task Force has been established. The task force includes representation from UC, Privates, CSU, PACT, CalTPA, and FAST. Lori asked if Interns are included. Teri will check.

Teri asked the group to evaluate the “Information on TPA Assessors” handout. Item 1, 2, 3, 8, and 12 in the handout are identified in segments regarding assessors. Is the information provided beneficial and useful for TPA to be used in the Biennial Report (BR)? BRs are to help institutions monitor their own programs and to accumulate over time the evidence in program assessment (Terry). They will also help site visitors determine whether programs are meeting the standards. PACT information is focused on items 3 and 12, and CalTPA information is provided on items 1, 2, and 8.

Discussion continued about what assessor information should be collected for the BR and what information can be useful regarding reliability of scorers and trainers. Caryl suggested 1) % of agreement in double scoring is useful information, and 2) assessor performance overtime might also be useful. What other assessor data should be collected and how should it be used for program improvement? The group reviewed the BR template (pg. 7-8). Number 1-3 on pg. 8 can be constructed in a table, and number 4 could be a briefly described paragraph (Jason). A table can be created and imported in the BR.

- Action Item: Wayne, Nicole, and Susan will create a mock-up table for the BR

### **Update on Data Collection Process**

Update on the TPA data collection will be reported at the January 2011 Commission Meeting. The interpretation of the data collected was discussed. Aggregation of data is difficult to understand because the data is not easily interpretable. Four PACT programs and two CalTPA programs did not submit TPA data. Barbara asked for the goal of collecting TPA data. Collection of TPA data is required by law. Only aggregated data is needed (Terry).

Terry provided the Ed. Code to the group concerning the collection of TPA data:

#### **TPA section 44320.2**

- D.7 Collection background information
- D.9 data used for quality and effectiveness of program

Michael handed out a spreadsheet sample of the 2008-2009 TPA data that programs submitted. The spreadsheet used to collect the data was difficult to work with. There needs to be a better process. Nicole reported that PACT forms did not work, and suggested using the existing PACT data already available through many electronic platforms such as TaskStream. PACT Central has a format for submitting data that has been in place for years.

For this first report, CTC staff should give a narrative report instead of a tabular report to the Commissioners (Steve). Report will not include actual data, but it will need to be reported (Terry). Some ideas for the next data collection are needed. The group will need to review the list of data/elements that have been collected, and find which elements can be reported without being

misused and will satisfy the law (Steve). In addition, data collection for each model and the directions given should be looked at across models to provide simplicity and clarification of information (Caryl).

**Review of 15% Random Reliability Double-scoring Options**

Steve moved this item to be placed early in the next agenda meeting.

**Continued discussion of candidate placement in classrooms with EL and SN students**

It is questioned whether this issue is across all models or due to a specific model's requirement. It is a big challenge for CalTPA candidates, but not currently for PACT and FAST. What is being done with outliers? (Wayne) If this issue is a model problem, Wayne will consult with the CalTPA Steering Committee. The group was questioned if a definitive statement from the Commission was needed to deal with outliers (Steve). CalTPA Steering Committee needs to make decisions about what to do (Caryl).

**Continued discussion of cross-model transfer**

Group confirmed that once a candidate completes any TPA model, it can transfer to another program without issue.

**Agenda items 6,7,9,10,11 will be carried over to the next meeting.**

**The next meeting date is scheduled for January 11, 2011 at the Commission from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m.**